

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

03-0118 (US01)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service via EFW-Web filing system to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450"

on April 10, 2007

Signature JLL

Typed or printed

Name Jocelyn L. Lee

Application Number

10/623,381

Filed

07/18/03

First Named Inventor

Lex P. Jansen, et al.

Art Unit

3738

Examiner

Willse, David H.

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)☒ attorney or agent of record.Registration number 42,339☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number _____



Signature

Michael J. Bolan

Typed or printed name

949-724-1849

Telephone number

4/10/07

Date

☒ *Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Lex P. Jansen, et al.

Serial No.: 10/623,381

Filed: July 18, 2003

For: **BIOCOMPATIBLE WIRES AND
METHODS OF USING SAME TO
FILL BONE VOID**

)
) **Confirmation No.:** 3194

)
) **Group Art Unit:** 3738

)
) **Examiner:** Willse, David H.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant hereby requests that this panel of examiners review the rejections of claims 25 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024463 ("Thomas").

Claim 25 requires the additional step of spraying uncured bone cement onto the web-like arrangement of wires to interconnect the wires at the points of contact. Claim 31 requires the device that applies the uncured bone cement onto the web-like arrangement of

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below via the USPTO EFS-Web filing system.

4/10/07

Date of Deposit



Jocelyn L. Lee

wires to be a spraying device. The Examiner did not specifically delineate the reasoning as to why claims 25 and 31 were anticipated by or obvious over Thomas. The Examiner did point to paragraph [0118] of Thomas for the teaching that it is known to introduce bone cement into vertebrae. However, it is neither known nor obvious to spray the bone cement onto a web-like arrangement of wires within a bone structure.

As discussed in the background of the present application, the prior art contemplated filling the cavity of the fractured vertebra with bone cement to increase the structural integrity of the vertebra. Thus, the most that Thomas suggests is that the cavity of the fractured vertebra is to be filled with a bone cement after implant of the wire. Notably, several problems are associated with this technique, including the filling of any space needed for long-term therapeutic treatment, necrosis of bone tissue due to the heat generating by the bone cement during the curing process, and shrinkage of the bone cement, thereby leaving a loose ball within the vertebral cavity. (See page 2, line 20 to page 3, line 5 of specification). However, by spraying bone cement to stabilize and reinforce of web-arrangement of wires, the structural integrity of a fractured vertebra can be increased without experiencing the problems associated with filling the vertebra cavity with bone cement. (See page 12, lines 13-25 of specification). Thomas does not suggest spraying bone cement on a web-arrangement of wires for this reason or for any other reason.


Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 25 and 31 be
allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: April 10, 2007

By:



Michael J. Boljan
Reg. No. 42,339

Customer No. 23410
Vista IP Law Group LLP
2040 Main Street, 9th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614